

# DRAFT

*Montana Fish, Wildlife & Parks*  
490 North Meridian Road, Kalispell, MT 59901  
(406) 752-5501

## **ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT CHECKLIST**

Fur Farm, Game Bird Farm, Zoo/Menagerie, Shooting Preserve

### **PART 1. PROPOSED ACTION DESCRIPTION**

Project Title: Lentz Fur Farm

Application Date: June 18, 2002

Name, Address, and Phone Number:

George Lentz  
1920 Whitefish Stage Road  
Kalispell, MT 59901

Project Location: Above address, Flathead County (T28N, R21W, Sec. 30)

Description of Project: The applicant owns 5 acres and wishes to house, raise, and sell bobcats and lynx on his property. The animals will be housed in wire cages and then enclosed with a chain link perimeter fence. The applicant will be buying out an existing fur farm. The applicant will start with 2 – 4 animals on the premises and see how it goes.

Other groups or agencies contacted or which may have overlapping jurisdiction:

## **PART 2. ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW**

Table 1. Potential impact on physical environment.

Will the proposed action result in potential impacts to:	Unknown	Potentially Significant	Minor	None	Can Be Mitigated	Comments Below or on Attached Pages
a. Unique, endangered, fragile, or limited environmental resources.				X		
b. Terrestrial or aquatic life and/or habitats.				X		
c. Introduction of new species into an area.				X		
d. Vegetation cover, quantity, & quality.				X		
e. Water quality, quantity, & distribution (surface or groundwater).			X			
f. Existing water right or reservation.				X		
g. Geology & soil quality, stability, & moisture.			X			
h. Air quality or objectional odors.			X			
i. Historical & archaeological sites.				X		
j. Demands on environmental resources of land, water, air, & energy.				X		
k. Aesthetics.				X		

### **Comments**

(A description of potentially significant, or unknown, impacts and potential alternatives for mitigation must be provided.)

1e. Impacts on surface water may be impacted if the pens and sites are not cleaned regularly. Cleaning the pens and the ground underneath them regularly will mitigate this potential impact.

1g. Soil quality may be impacted with addition of cat urine and feces to the areas underneath the pens. Regular cleaning will lessen this impact.

1h. Objectionable odors may come from the pen site. Regular cleaning will help reduce these odors. Some impact will occur even with adequate cleaning.

Table 2. Potential impacts on human environment .

Will the proposed action result in potential impacts to:	Unknown	Potentially Significant	Minor	None	Can Be Mitigated	Comments Below Or On Attached Pages
a. Social structures and cultural diversity.				X		
b. Changes in existing public benefits provided by wildlife populations and/or habitat.				X		
c. Local and state tax base and tax revenue.				X		
d. Agricultural production.				X		
e. Human health.				X		
f. Quantity & distribution of community & personal income.				X		
g. Access to & quality of recreational activities.				X		
h. Locally adopted environmental plans & goals (ordinances).				X		
i. Distribution & density of population and housing.				X		
j. Demands for government services.				X		
k. Industrial and/or commercial activity.				X		

### **Comments**

(A description of potentially significant, or unknown, impacts and potential alternatives for mitigation must be provided as comments.)

Does the proposed action involve potential risks or adverse effects, which are uncertain but extremely harmful if they were to occur? No

Does the proposed action have impacts that are individually minor, but cumulatively significant or potentially significant? Possibly this may occur if the people do not clean pens and site on a timely basis. Again, if the site and pens are kept clean, then impact will be minimal.

Description and analysis of reasonable alternatives (including the no-action alternative) to the proposed action, when alternatives are reasonably available and prudent to consider. Include a discussion of how the alternatives would be implemented:

Alternative 1: Issue the permit with or without stipulations.

Alternative 2: Deny the permit.

Alternative 3: Take no action on the proposal.

List suggested mitigative measures for license:

1. All animals possessed in this facility must be obtained from private sources.
2. Documentation of sources must be available for inspection.
3. All fur farm rules and regulations must be followed and adhered to.
4. All pens and the overall site will be kept clean on a regular basis.

Individuals or groups contributing to, or commenting on, this EA: None

Date EA completed: July 1, 2002

Duration of comment period:

This EA was placed on the MFWP website from July 8 until July 22. Comments can be mailed to Warden Brian Sommers at the address below or e-mailed to bsommers@digisys.net.

EA prepared by: Warden Brian Sommers  
Fish, Wildlife & Parks  
490 N Meridian Road  
Kalispell, MT 59901  
(406) 751-4562

### **PART 3. DECISION**

Recommendation and justification concerning preparation of EIS:

Describe public involvement, if any:

Recommendation for license approval: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
Daniel P. Vincent, Supervisor Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Jim Williams, Wildlife Manager Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Ed Kelly, Warden Captain Date